

And let me remind you that when I talk about party unity, I know what I'm talking about. I have campaigned for Republicans, all Republicans, in virtually every State of this Union. I've made speech after speech on behalf of Republicans right here in New York.

I was working for party unity and for party victory then—and I'm working for party unity and victory now.

I think that the heart of this party is sound. I think that the principles of this party are sound.

I have voted for those principles—I have worked for those principles—I have lived by those principles.

Disagree? Of course we Republicans are bound to disagree on this or that point.

But when it comes to basic principles we can and must unite.

And right here and now I'd like to suggest that there is a way to do just that, to clear up the virus of divisiveness that is attacking the bloodstream of our party.

Our party's only really current statement of principle is the 1962 declaration prepared by a joint committee of Senate and House members. These were not men who were trying to make personal points. These were not men trying to read fellow Republicans out of the party. These were men such as THURSTON MORTON, JOHN TOWER, BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, WALLACE BENNETT, GEORGE AIKEN, and your own KEN KEATING in the Senate. Your Congressman, CHARLES GOONELL, was one of the distinguished members on the House side.

This was a group that showed the real strength and broad appeal of our great party. Here was a group to unite the party, not split and twist it.

SUBSCRIBES TO DECLARATION

And I say this with every ounce of my conviction: I subscribe to that declaration of principle.

And I say this with every ounce of hope I can muster: let all Republicans stand up and be counted on their party's principles, right now. I have done it repeatedly. I will continue to do it.

Let us hear from the others.

I am sick to death of the rule-or-ruin talk that demands loyalty to a faction above loyalty to the party and its national responsibilities. And let's remember that this is a national party now—not a regional one.

The declaration of our party is clear. I stand on it. Most Republicans stand on it. Now let those few who remain on the sidelines stand up and be counted so that we can get on with the job of winning this election.

Here is a way to constructive action. Here is a path to unity. I say it's a path that's broad enough and straight enough for all of us to travel.

This is where I stand. No Democrat is going to crowd me off. And I can assure you 10 times over—no Republican is going to do it either.

Our Republican principles are clear. They are based upon five fundamentals.

We believe in the individual. We believe that men can govern themselves, set their own goals, find their own solutions—without the restraints of dictatorship or paternalism.

Do I subscribe to that? Why, I've spent the past 11 years of my life talking about and working for nothing else but that.

We Republicans believe that the dignity and the freedom of the individual comes from God—not from government.

We believe that government is created to maintain order, to secure the national defense—to do only those things for the people which they cannot do for themselves.

PLEDGES HARD WORK

No man has worked harder for the concrete actions to implement that statement

than I have. And I pledge you this: no President would work harder for the same principle than I would if my party and my fellow citizens select me for the job.

We Republicans want to see the power of government returned to the people—that's where it started and that's where it should stay.

Again, I don't give just lip service to that principle. I believe that there are sound courses which a President can and should follow to implement the principle.

Every legislative proposal should be subjected to these rigid tests:

Is the proposal actually responsive to a demonstrated need, or is it responsible mainly to political pressure or political advantage?

If there is real need, can it be met by community action, or individual action? If it can, it should be encouraged in that way. If not, can the need be met at the local level, or the State level, or through regional arrangements? Only when the answer is clearly no, should the Federal Government intrude.

A President, more interested in freedom than in executive power, could restore balance in our Government, return power to the people—and get the needed jobs of this Nation done without regimenting our people or ruining our Federal system.

That Federal system is based upon the responsibility and the constitutional independence of our 50 great States.

An administration that attempts to tear down the constitutional role of the States is tearing down the very structure of our freedom.

And I charge that this Administration is doing just that. I charge that it reaches recklessly for new power at every opportunity.

Let this Administration continue in power and we may well live to see the day that the 50 States of this Nation become just 50 pigeonholes in a new Washington bureau.

SEVERAL APPROACHES

I can suggest several concrete approaches to assure this.

Immediate and serious studies should be made to determine every area in which the administration of Federal programs can to any degree be turned over to State or local governments without injury to the program.

This would not mean abandoning these programs. It would mean assuring their effective administration as close as possible to the people actually affected, as close as possible to the people actually paying the bills.

Parallel studies should be carried out to bring order out of the increasing chaos of competition for tax dollars between State, local, and Federal governments.

Whenever possible we should reject the bureaucratically expensive system of taking money from the States, passing it through a Washington bureau, and then, returning what is left right back where it came from.

Our goal should be to retain tax moneys as close as possible to their point of origin.

Our States must once again be full partners in the Federal system, morally, financially, and legally.

If we cannot stand together in our diversity of region, in our diversity of ways of life, in the diversity of our State and cities—if we cannot stand together in that diversity, our freedom surely shall fall.

START AT HOME

I've heard Democrats telling the world that we are prepared to coexist with a diversity of communism, tyranny and aggression. I'd much rather have tolerance for diversity, like charity, start at home.

We Republicans have spelled out another principle. We believe that "government must act to help establish conditions of equal opportunity for all people and to help

assure that no one is denied the requisites for a life of dignity."

Now that is word for word from our declaration of principle.

Under Republicans, more has been done to implement that belief than under any other party.

But there is a vast difference between the Republican way and the way of this present administration.

Real progress was made, under Republican principles and Republican leaders.

It was made without violence without taking matters into the streets—on either side.

Republicans passed laws with which the people of this land could live and through which, in patience, and in understanding, they could seek the meeting of minds and the opening of hearts which are the only ultimate solutions.

Republicans want to see government, as our declaration says, helping the cause of equal opportunity. They do not want to see government as the cheerleader for a frightful game of violence, destruction, and disobedience.

And once again, I point to the Republican principle of getting things done at the local level before calling out the Federal programs—or the Federal troops.

Where are the States which today are witnessing the most violence? I sadly remind you that they are the very States where there is the most talk about brotherhood and the very least opportunity for achieving it.

SAYS OLD LAWS AREN'T AT WORK

I sadly remind you that we are seeing violence today in those very States which are proving that new laws alone are not the answer. There are too many of the old laws which aren't even working.

And there is this above all, the oldest law of all: You cannot pass a law that will make me like you—or you like me. This is something that can only happen in our hearts.

The right to vote; of course. The right to an education; of course. There are laws to secure those rights. But until we have an administration that will cool the fires and the tempers of violence we simply cannot solve the rest of the problem in any lasting sense.

And I say this to you with the deepest possible sense of tragedy and regret—unless we do get such an administration we are going to see more violence in our streets before we see less.

I pray to God that every American, regardless of his race or creed will come to his senses in time to restore some commonsense and common decency to this situation. It badly needs both.

PARTY OF PAYROLLS

The final point of the five basic principles spelled out in our party's declaration evolves from a fact that every American should recognize: the Republican Party is the party of payrolls and production. It is our opponents who are the party of debts, depression, and doles.

The Republican Party understands good times and how to keep them. It understands that if we Americans can't live within our means, we are going to be reduced to living without means.

Our fifth principle states very clearly that government must prudently weigh needs against resources, put first things first, rigorously tailor means to ends, and understand the difference between words and deeds.

The practical application of this should be very clear. A Republican President—at least this Republican President—would be working for a balanced budget in times such as these rather than digging us deeper into the red.

I say that this is the time to be paying off our debts, not piling up new ones.

Now those principles cover our party's approach to the essential dignity of man as an individual, not a zip number on a government chart.

Those principles over our approach to limited government, to local responsibility, to the prudent rather than reckless use of taxes, and to the civilized resolution of civic problems.

I say that those principles are worth fighting for.

I say they are what we should be fighting about—with Lyndon Johnson.

And one other thing. I've spoken so far about the application of Republican principles to pressing domestic needs.

ATTACKS FOREIGN POLICY

How about foreign policy? How about the issue that Lyndon Johnson wants to forget about?

How about a foreign policy so mysterious and so hard to understand that Lyndon Johnson has had to offer us secret briefings to explain it?

Yes. How about that?

I turned those briefings down the minute I heard about them. U.S. Senators have secret information. They just don't throw it around for political advantage the way this administration does.

I say we need less secrecy in our foreign policy, not more.

If anybody needs a briefing, it's the whole American public. Not a briefing full of secrets—but a briefing full of facts.

Facts about Cuba—facts about South Vietnam—facts about Soviet nuclear testing and advances—facts about how far we are willing to go to appease communism—and facts about the strength of our deterrent forces over the next 10 years.

I have spoken at length on all of those topics. My position is clear.

And I say that, in root and base, it is as simple as this: The only way we can keep the peace is to keep our strength.

It is the foreign policy of Dwight Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles that kept the peace. I want to restore that policy. It is the confusion and evasion of Lyndon Johnson that is gambling the peace.

And what does our Republican declaration of principle have to say about this? Is it muddled or unclear? Should any Republican be in doubt about it? Not at all. Just listen:

"In foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism, through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence.

"There can be no real peace short of it."

Now I want and I need the support of all Republicans. And I rest my case on this great point. "In foreign policy the overriding national goal must be victory over communism. . . ."

That is our Republican declaration.

I ask only this: Let your support go to the man you feel can best serve that declaration.

And then, let us work together, united and dedicated, so that an American President can tell Nikita Khrushchev: You are wrong. Our children will not live under communism. Your children will live under freedom.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1964]
GOLDWATER SEES NEW RACE STRIFE UNLESS GOP WINS—AT MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, HE SAYS THAT REPUBLICAN WOULD "COOL THE FIRES"

(By Earl Mazo)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona said last night that effective progress in civil

rights would be achieved without turmoil and bloodshed if Republicans were elected to power in Washington.

In a speech prepared for a campaign fundraising rally at Madison Square Garden, Senator GOLDWATER, the leading candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, indirectly accused the Democratic administration of President Johnson of acting as "cheerleader" for a "frightful game of violence, destruction, and disobedience" over civil rights.

He predicted more violence in our streets until a Republican President is selected to cool the fires and the tempers of violence.

Only then, the Senator added, would it be possible to reach acceptable and lasting solutions to the problems of racial discrimination.

Senator GOLDWATER reviewed a range of foreign and domestic issues, and repeatedly emphasized the need for Republican unity in the national election in November.

Without mentioning names, he criticized Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, and some other liberal Republicans who have indicated that they would withhold their support if Senator GOLDWATER becomes the party nominee at the Republican National Convention in July.

RULE-OR-RUIN TALK

Senator GOLDWATER characterized that as rule-or-ruin talk by a faction of the party, and insisted that any Republican who downgrades fellow Republicans is pinch-hitting for Lyndon Johnson.

In answer to liberals who have charged Senator GOLDWATER with turning his back on the party's 1960 platform, the Senator endorsed and pledged all-out backing for a declaration of Republican principles issued in June 1962 by a 12-member joint committee of Republican Senators and Representatives.

The declaration updated and reaffirmed the 1960 platform. The committee that framed it was headed by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, principal architect of the 1960 platform and chairman of the party's 1964 platform committee.

Shortly before Senator GOLDWATER's scheduled appearance here, his campaign headquarters in Washington released a State-by-State breakdown of delegates to the Republican National Convention. These figures showed the Senator to be a runaway leader for the nomination at this point.

About 18,000 well-wishers were reported to have paid from \$2 to \$1,000 for seats in the huge Madison Square Garden arena, adding approximately \$100,000 to the Goldwater campaign fund.

The candidate was flanked on the dais by a dozen Representatives and one Senator. None of the party figures was from New York, where the Republican organization supports Governor Rockefeller for the nomination.

President Johnson is to address a Democratic fundraising meeting at Madison Square Garden on May 28. Admission will also range up to \$1,000, but the Democrats expect a net collection considerably greater than that of the Goldwater rally.

In his prepared speech, Senator Goldwater vigorously criticized President Johnson's foreign and domestic operations generally, and called the President a "wheeler-dealer."

The Senator maintained that Mr. Johnson was downgrading the States, gambling with America's security, and playing politics with the antipoverty drive, civil rights, and other matters.

He pointed with pride to the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy as a keeper of the peace.

"I want to restore that policy," he declared. The rally included band music, folk singing, speeches by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and others, and the introduction of Mrs. Goldwater.

The mimeographed program called for a demonstration to begin at 9:15 p.m., when the Senator entered the hall. Exactly 15 minutes was allotted to the demonstration.

THE FAIRCHILD GARDENS IN MIAMI, FLA

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in the February 4, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my remarks covering H.R. 9893 for a charter for a national tropical botanical garden, there seemed to be some doubt cast on the value of the Fairchild Gardens in Miami, Fla. There was no intention of doing this as I feel it is a well known and valuable garden and has done excellent work. I was trying to convey that the garden contemplated in my bill will be a comprehensive tropical botanical garden covering many climatic conditions found in the tropics. There is no such garden in the United States at the present time. The bill seeks a garden for national use and benefit. It seeks a research institution covering tropical plants, many of which are not adaptable to Florida.

May I thank the people of Florida for their calling my attention to the matter and for their support of H.R. 9893. I wish them all success in their efforts at Fairchild Gardens.

CUBAN DRUG PROBE NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, late last week Cuba sent out bids to major U.S. drug manufacturers in an effort to purchase large quantities of drugs from this Nation. The Department of Commerce has already received inquiries regarding export licensing procedures. One manufacturer alone, Parke, Davis Co., was asked to bid on approximately \$6 million worth of drugs, and estimates of the total bidding have run as high as \$15 million.

Needless to say, if Castro could purchase any goods from this Nation it would be embarrassing at this time. Castro is clearly trying to undercut current U.S. efforts to halt Western Europe's trade with Cuba.

A full and immediate investigation of this deal should be launched by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member. This committee has jurisdiction over the U.S. drug industry and exports as well.

The humanitarian aspects of this deal are questionable. I have been advised that there are no known health crises in Cuba today. The drugs requested are of a quality easily obtainable from manufacturers in other countries. It is the large quantity of these bids which has U.S. authorities disturbed.

Castro needs this sale only to embarrass the United States. The Congress should probe this situation before any such export licenses are granted.

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. HECHLER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. SAYLOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE BOBBY BAKER CASE

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Don Reynolds, the Silver Spring insurance man, finds himself out in the cold as far as the District of Columbia Life Underwriters are concerned. They dismissed him from membership on the grounds that he has been guilty of conduct unbecoming a member of the association. It is apparent that they frown on the dealings of Bobby Baker who helped Reynolds in the sale of a large life insurance policy, which involved a kickback in the form of a fine stereo set. And perhaps they frown on a Washington area insurance man buying radio-TV time on a station in Texas where he obviously would find few prospects for insurance.

The underwriters are, of course, to be commended for their high standards of ethics even though it means, as a Washington Star editorial said the other day, that Reynolds "takes the rap." We may well regret that the Democratic leadership in the Senate does not feel it necessary that such high standards be followed in Government. They apparently have terminated their investigation of the Bobby Baker case, leaving dozens of questions unanswered, many witnesses uncalled, an unsavory mess swept under the rug, and an apparent insistence that their conduct and their ethics are no concern to the general public.

The leadership hope, I suppose, is that people will have forgotten by November. It is a sad commentary on the way business is too often done in Washington.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following correction be made in the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] which appear on page 10121 of the Record of May 11.

Beginning with the last paragraph in the first column, the remainder of the matter should appear in small type, and in each instance where the words "Mr. Speaker" appear they should be corrected to read "Mr. Chairman," and that the entire material be printed in the body of today's Record, as corrected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to my distinguished, able, and revered colleague from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary:

DEAR CHAIRMAN CELLER: A few days ago I received a letter from a prominent clergyman in New York, who associated himself with some of the most eminent clergymen and prominent religious leaders in our Nation and in the world. Mr. Chairman, to me this was a shocking letter. The last paragraph of this letter is as follows:

"As spiritual leaders, our opposition to these proposals is based on a deep commitment to religious values. We believe that the spiritual communion with God, which is the purpose of prayer and Bible reading, cannot be achieved by their mechanical repetition in an atmosphere devoid of the religious spirit which only the home, the church, and the synagogue can supply. Because such cheapening of prayer and of the Bible is not helpful to religion but hurtful to it and because the various proposals to amend the Constitution would make such cheapening inevitable, we oppose them and strongly urge you to do the same."

Mr. Chairman, prayer and supplication to our Heavenly Father and to His Son, Jesus Christ, is not cheap anywhere or at any time. It was not cheapened when offered from the foxholes and battlefields of Europe during World War II, or the jungles of the South Pacific, or the frozen ridges of Korea. Prayer is not cheap today when offered in South Vietnam or in our outposts throughout the world.

Prayer was not cheap when Benjamin Franklin knelt in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 and asked divine guidance upon that Convention and upon the Founding Fathers.

Mr. Chairman, prayer is not cheap when our revered and beloved Dr. Braskamp recites Scripture and opens the daily sessions of this House of Representatives with prayer. It was not cheap when the great Peter Marshall offered prayer in the Senate. It is not cheap today when the eminent Frederick B. Harris opens the sessions of the U.S. Senate with prayer. Prayer was not cheap when men like Dr. Abram Verelde, executive director of International Christian Leadership, knelt in my office, although a Government building, and asked divine guidance upon the Congress and upon my own personal deliberations.

My father was ordained as a Baptist minister at Pine Pleasant Baptist Church in Saluda County, S.C., within whispering distance of the burial place of Luther Rice, founder of George Washington University and one of the founders of the Southern Baptist Convention. My father and mother always opened the schools they taught with prayer and Bible reading.

I have visited many public schools and always considered it reverent when the students or the teachers read the Scriptures and offered prayer. It is always a moving experience for me when visiting schools, as I often do, to see young men and women lead their fellow classmates in the devotional period. This is nothing cheap. The entire student body is more reverent and more respectful during this period than any other. Recently I was thrilled to see a young man, 11 or 12 years old, dressed in his very best "Sunday suit," conduct the devotional period at a junior high school. He was well groomed, well trained, gracious and elegant in manner. His devotional was comparable to any I have heard anywhere. This is superb training for those ideals and Christian principles which made our Nation great.

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Dorn and I have been blessed with five children, four of whom attend the public schools. I want them to have the privilege of listening to Bible reading and prayer in the schools on a voluntary basis.

Moses Waddell, that great Presbyterian minister and one of the first presidents of the University of Georgia, when he conducted his backwoods, log cabin school at Willington, S.C., always opened classes with prayer and Bible reading in the morning and closed with prayer in the afternoon. His students, being thoroughly familiar with the Bible, with Shakespeare, the classics, discipline, and hard work, were able to influence the very destiny of this Nation. Out of his school came John C. Calhoun, Vice President of the United States; William H. Crawford, who missed the Presidency by a few votes; Hugh S. Legare, Attorney General and Secretary of State; many Governors, U.S. Senators and Congressmen; and a host of prominent educators and ministers of the Gospel.

Mr. Chairman, I solicit earnestly your consideration of the resolution which I introduced to amend the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Chairman, Senator TALMADGE of Georgia is correct. The Supreme Court has already amended the Constitution with its decision against prayer and Bible reading in the schools. It is now necessary with my resolution to eliminate this Supreme Court amendment and restore freedom of religion, as intended in the first amendment to the Constitution.

I respectfully and sincerely urge that you and your great committee very earnestly and reverently consider the resolution I have introduced.

Sincerely,
WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRASER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRASER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A DAY OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

(Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, this has been a significant week in Connecticut for the future of our people and our communities. On Monday, we marked the opening of the new Constitution Plaza development, a 12-acre complex in Hartford. Shortly, we expect to complete approval of the South Central project in New Britain, a major, roughly 90-acre project.

The Constitution Plaza program, which has drawn national attention, is one of the most dramatic in the Nation. It

has been a product of long and painstaking effort by many men and women. I am offering for the Record an editorial, "The Day of Accomplishment," from the Hartford Times, which mentions some of the people in Hartford who deserve particular credit, including the late William H. Putnam, a man of great vision, who supported this program fully.

Some of the feeling of the community is expressed in an editorial, "A Look Ahead on a Sunny Day in May," from the Hartford Courant, which I also offer for the Record. The Courant sets forth the satisfaction which all of us, both here in Congress and in the community must feel. For this is a broad scale program, that has required the best services of many men over the years. The support which Congress has given to urban renewal and redevelopment reaches fulfillment in the newness and vigor of this program.

Hartford was designated an All-American City just 2 years ago for the persistent, energetic effort it made to build a new community. It had begun in 1950, when Hartford applied for the first federally sponsored redevelopment project in Connecticut.

For 6 years, community leaders worked out the possibilities and talked with the people about the prospects of urban renewal, and what it could mean for the people. They had the vision to see a finer Hartford, and without vision, it is said, the people will perish. Gradually, their vision prevailed. Business leaders listened and joined up. The local chamber of commerce got behind the planning. A committee for Hartford was formed. And when it went to a vote, the city gave it a smashing "yea" by a 5 to 1 margin.

In all honesty, it should be conceded that an element of competition helped in this progress. For New Haven, which has traditionally been Hartford's most populous rival in the State, was making its own plans and was attaining a great deal of national reputation.

The full and detailed story appeared in the New York Times on May 10, and I offer that for the Record. I would caution, however, that the reporter was somewhat overdramatic. He has portrayed the area which was replaced as a bad slum area. In all truth, it should be pointed out that this was a neighborhood and community area on the fringe of a commercial area, plagued by the nearness of the Connecticut River and by an intermixture of commercial and residential development. The people of the area, moving to other parts of the city and into the suburbs, have established fine new communities.

Many of our cities have recognized the need to undertake a program of urban renewal. Hartford has some nine different projects in being, involving \$29.5 million in Federal grants. New Haven has nine projects, involving \$68 million. Farmington, one of the finest small communities in the State, has also actively developed its planning activities and qualified for assistance.

The Federal program has drawn the enthusiastic support of all elements of the State. Connecticut's General As-

sembly voted a program to participate and help the communities in their efforts, now an integral part of most programs. The Connecticut Development Commission has assisted in planning programs. Local communities have developed their plans, earmarked local funds and done yeoman work in bringing about progress. In all, some 68 communities in Connecticut have urban renewal programs underway, with help from the Federal Government amounting to \$236 million. This is a small sum, measured against the total commitments of our national budget, but it is a sturdy bulwark for a future America.

I have mentioned New Britain, which has also worked hard to develop its urban renewal activities. An industrial community, with a worldwide reputation for hardware, New Britain has been planning and working for a better future over many years, with the loyal and constant support of the New Britain Herald and other communications outlets.

New Britain is on the threshold of approval for its south central program, which offers new hope for commercial and industrial development in the city and the very important germination of new jobs. Its planning began in 1956, when Mayor Joseph Morelli named a commission to bring into being a specific plan for modernizing the city. Throughout the intervening years, with the help of such officials as Mayor Julius Kremiski and Mayor Thomas Meskill, the city has continued to work for completion of these projects. And the present mayor, James F. Dawson, who was an attorney with the first commission, has the credit for seeing the final approval.

Throughout these years, the urban renewal program has received strong support from Members of Congress who are concerned with our communities. It has been a model of public and private cooperation. Both I and Congressman BERNARD GRABOWSKI, who now represent Hartford and New Britain, have worked with local officials and with the executive agencies to expedite action, to see that the communities met standards imposed by this Congress, and to reach final action. Senator THOMAS J. DONN and Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, who is a native of New Britain, have also worked in behalf of these communities.

Today, perhaps, throughout the Nation, some critics have sought to raise a clamor against the concept of urban renewal. These critics are answered ably, I think, in the remarks of Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver, and I offer for the Record the text of the speech which he delivered in Hartford on Monday in a new hotel which is part of the Constitution Plaza complex and which was heard by Hartford's business and civic leaders.

The challenge of our vastly expanded population is great. The accelerated urbanization and industrialization of recent decades has produced a new America of great concentration, but accompanied by congestion, urban decay, continued and increasing demand for public facilities. Renewal is one weapon in the people's arsenal against these prob-

lems, one that requires the steady and persistent efforts of fine people over the years. Connecticut's successes this week are a tribute to those people and their sincere and dedicated effort. Those successes are described well in the news stories from the Hartford Times and the Courant which I also append.

The above-mentioned material follows:

[From the Hartford Times, May 12, 1964]

THE DAY OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

The dedication of Constitution Plaza formally completes a regionally important civic work that is a credit to its planners and financiers.

It is also a matter of satisfaction to all who shared in its inspiration and motivation during long years when, actually, few considered that this vast project ever would be started—much less accomplished.

Looking back, one must not fail to compliment the tact, diplomacy, and hard work of those who manned the redevelopment agency under the late William H. Putnam, cooperating to the fullest extent also were the then Mayor James H. Kinsella and the leadership of the chamber of commerce.

Individual citizens gave their time and support unstintingly to the "Big Blue Sky Deal" as redevelopment on the east side once was jokingly called. This didn't start as a big deal, however. It began as a very uncertain enterprise.

The Hartford Times is proud that it first, by pointing out the need, then by urging and backing action, brought together all of the elements of prestige, finance, skill, and community drive that resulted in public acceptance of this effort which once was very much opposed and had stalled.

The ceremonies were inspirational in that they brought again to notice what a city oppressed by rundown sections of blight may do to raise its physical and economic standards.

Large as Constitutional Plaza is, it is just a good start for what must be done downtown and elsewhere to keep Hartford modern and attractive. We are happy to have welcomed Administrator Robert C. Weaver of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency and Commissioner Robert L. Slayton of the Urban Renewal Administration.

Now, on to the other jobs, each of them made easier by realization that nothing that is essentially good and sound for Hartford is impossible or will fail of public support.

[From the Hartford Courant]

A LOOK AHEAD ON A SUNNY NOON IN MAY

Had the weather been ordered in advance for yesterday's dedication of Constitution Plaza, it couldn't have turned out better. The azure New England sky with white-puffed clouds, the flags raised up and flapping in a breeze, the band, the words well spoken and mercifully brief, all celebrated another milestone now set in place in the city's three and a quarter centuries of history.

The theme as set by the master of ceremonies, the Traveler's Herbert Kramer, and as signaled by the tolling of the bell of the historic U.S.S. Hartford was that of memorializing past, present, and future. What was most promising was the way in which the speakers, on an occasion celebrating an accomplishment now behind us, all nevertheless turned to the future.

Thus at the luncheon that followed the open-air observance Gladden Baker, financial sparkplug of Constitution Plaza, noted the other redevelopment projects already in process or coming soon in the city. And as Dr. Weaver said in the main luncheon speech, the downtown decay now replaced with strong, fresh life came not from lack of wares in the old city, but from lack of people.